1 2 3	DAVID J. SAMUELSEN, ESQ. (CBN #72504) JENNIFER A. KUNG, ESQ. (CBN #169364) BENNETT, SAMUELSEN, REYNOLDS & ALLARD A Professional Corporation 1301 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 300
4	Alameda, CA 94501
5	Telephone: (510) 444-7688 Facsimile: (510) 444-5849
6	Attorneys for Defendant LAWRENCE KAM
7	
8	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	ANDREW BOYD, NO. C07-03595 JCS
12	Plaintiff, ANSWER OF DEFENDANT LAWRENCE KAM TO COMPLAINT
13	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
14	LAWRENCE KAM,
15 16	Defendant.
17	Defendant LAWRENCE KAM now responds to and answers Plaintiff's Complaint.
18	1. In answer to paragraph 1 of the complaint, Defendant admits that jurisdiction is
19	appropriate in federal court.
20	2. In answer to paragraph 2 of the complaint, Defendant admits that venue is
21	appropriate in the United States District Court, Northern District of California.
22	3. In answer to paragraph 3 of the complaint, Defendant admits that Plaintiff's
23	complaint is for damages based upon an allegation of negligence arising out of
24	a rear-end motor vehicle accident that occurred on July 14, 2005. However,
25	Defendant denies the conclusion he alone was negligent in the operation of his
26	motor vehicle based upon lack of information and belief in that Plaintiff's own
27	comparative negligence has not yet been established.

- 1-

- 5
- 7. 6
- 7
- 8 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- BENNETT, SAMUELSEN,
- REYNOLDS & ALLARD A PROFESSIONAL CORP. 1301 MARINA VILLAGE PARKWAY, SUITE 300 ALAMEDA, CA 94501

- In answer to paragraph 4 of the complaint, Defendant admits Plaintiff's complaint 4. seeks compensatory and special damages.
- In answer to paragraph 5 of the complaint, Defendant admits based upon 5. information and belief.
- In answer to paragraph 6 of the complaint, Defendant admits. 6.
- In answer to paragraph 7 of the complaint, Defendant admits.
- In answer to paragraph 8 of the complaint, Defendant admits. 8.
- In answer to paragraph 9 of the complaint, Defendant denies the conclusion he 9. was proceeding at 65 m.p.h. at a distance of approximately 20 feet behind Plaintiff. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or belief to admit or deny the allegation that traffic began to slow and eventually came to a stop, or that Plaintiff had been stopped for a brief period of time, and on that basis deny each and every remaining allegation. Defendant admits that Plaintiff's vehicle was struck in the rear by Defendant's vehicle.
- In answer to paragraph 10 of the complaint, Defendant denies the conclusion he 10. was negligent, careless or reckless in the operation of his motor vehicle based upon lack of information and belief in that Plaintiff's own comparative negligence has not yet been established.
- 11. In answer to paragraph 11 of the complaint, Defendant incorporates by this reference their responses to paragraphs 1-10, above, and repeat them as if fully set forth herein...
- In answer to paragraph 12, of the complaint, Defendant denies each and every 12. allegation.
- In answer to paragraph 13 of the complaint, Defendant denies each and every 13. allegation.
- In answer to paragraph 14 of the complaint, Defendant denies each and every 14. allegation and further denies that Plaintiff has been injured or damaged in the sum

2

4 5

6 7

9

8

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

alleged, in any other sum, or otherwise, or at all.

- 15. In answer to paragraph 15 of the complaint, Defendant denies each and every allegation
- 16. In answer to paragraph 16 of the complaint, Defendant denies each and every allegation.

## AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

## **First Affirmative Defense**

Defendant alleges that plaintiff and others were negligent in and about the matters referred to in said Complaint, and that such negligence bars and/or diminishes plaintiff's right to recovery against this answering defendant. Should plaintiff recover damages against this defendant, said defendant is entitled to have the amount abated, reduced, or eliminated to the extent plaintiff's negligence caused or contributed to his damages, if any there were.

## **Second Affirmative Defense**

Defendant alleges that plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim against this answering defendant.

WHEREFORE, this answering defendant prays that plaintiff takes nothing by reason of said Complaint; that this answering defendant be awarded costs of suit herein and such other and further relief that the Court deem just; that if this answering defendant is found liable, that the degree of responsibility and liability for the resulting damages be determined, and this answering defendant be held liable for only the portion of the total damages for which he is legally responsible.

DATED: September 26, 200

В١

David J. Samuelsen Attorneys for Defendant LAWRENCE KAM

- 3-

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 3-6(a) of the Federal Rules - Northern District, Defendant LAWRENCE KAM hereby demands a jury trial.

DATED: September 26, 2007

BY

David J. Samuelsen Attorneys for Defendant LAWRENCE KAM

- 4-

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years. On September 2 **2007**, I served the attached: 3 ANSWER TO COMPLAINT 4 on the interested parties in said cause, by placing ( X ) the original; ( ) a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows: 6 Walter Lee Davis 22320 Foothill Blvd., #600 Havward, CA 94541 8 BY MAIL: I caused such envelope(s) to be placed in the United States mail, [XXX ] 9 postage fully prepaid, in accordance with the standard business practices of this office, in the city of Alameda, California. 10 BY HAND: I caused such envelope to be picked up and delivered to the office(s) of 1 the addressee(s) in accordance with the standard business practices of this office. 11 BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY: I caused such envelope to be delivered to 12 1 IOVERNIGHT SERVICE NAMEI for delivery to the office(s) of the addressee(s) as listed above the following day in accordance with the standard business practices of 13 this office. 14 BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION: I caused a copy of such document to be sent via facsimile to the office(s) of the addressee(s) as listed above in accordance with the 15 standard business practices of this office. A true and correct copy of the facsimile 16 confirmation sheet(s) is attached hereto. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the 17 foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on September, 2007. Alameda, California. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Boyd v. Kam

26

27

United States District Court Northern District of California Case No.: C07-03595

S:\DJS\ACTIVE FILES\Boyd v. Kam CSA 4955\POS.wpd